UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,013	06/23/2003	Jerry A. Waldorf	15437-0785	7667

45657 7590 04/16/2007

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
AND SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC.
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, LECHI	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/602,013	WALDORF, JERRY A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LeChi Truong	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 June 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *22-50* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 16-20* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *15 and 21* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/2/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for the examination.

2. Applicant is required to cancel all non-elected claims (22-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. The language of claims 1-21 raise a question as to whether the claims are abstract ideas and would not result in practical application producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result to form the basic of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101. For example, retrieving codes for message of the API, determining a hierarchical structure of the code, displaying the message structure of the API, displaying a new message structure, receiving a request to added the child node, displaying the representation of the added child node are abstract ideas that do not produce any tangible result<e.g. just a though or just a computation within a processor which does not provide an output thereby creating a tangible result which enables the usefulness to be realized>.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims **1-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ching et al (US 6,407 761 B1) in view Vedula et al (US. 6,823,495 B1).

As to claim 1, Ching teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a structure for a message for a software object corresponding to an application program interface (API)(BAPI interfaces are specific methods of Business Object, col 5, ln 8-9), within a graphical user interface (A graphical user interface is provided with displays all of the business object, col 2, ln 49-52/ the hierarchical data structure stored in the data storage mechanism is then mapped into the menu-driven graphical user interface, col 6, ln 25-29), retrieving a code for the message structure of the API(col 6, ln 30-35), where the nodes with node names(an upper case B character next to the name text of the item is an example of a method, col 6, ln 55-60), a hierarchical structure for the nodes(hierarchical data structure as depicted in Fig. 8, col 6, ln 21-24), determining a hierarchical structure of the code of the message structure for the API(col 6, ln 30-35); and displaying the message structure of the API in a pane of the graphical user interface in a hierarchical according to the hierarchical structure of the message(col 7, ln 44-53).

Ching does not explicitly teach the delimiter indicate a hierarchical. However, Vedula teaches the delimiter indicate a hierarchical (a user has selected record node RECORD1 in the source tree 6 as indicated by node selection indicia 18a in FIG. 3A, the source node properties page 34 may indicate the name, description, type, model, content, and other properties associated with the node Record1col 10, ln 30-36).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Ching to incorporate the feature of the delimiter indicate a hierarchical because this allows business personal to efficiently generate document mapping without extensive knowledge of programming languages or the assistance of programmers.

As to claim 2, Ching teaches a node corresponds to an API function (col 5, ln 8-10).

As to claim 3, Ching teaches a node from the message is selected from the group consisting of element nodes, field nodes, method nodes, and parameter nodes, and where an element node can have a sub-node selected from the group consisting of an element, field, method, and parameter, a field node has no sub-nodes, a method node can have a sub-node of parameter type, and a parameter node has no sub-nodes (col 6, ln 21-25/ Fig. 8).

As to claim 4, Ching teaches the code is a text-based code, where determining the hierarchical structure further comprises parsing the text-based code (col 6, ln 54-65).

As to claim 5, Ching teaches determining when a pointer that is manipulated by a pointing device is guided over a node symbol and when an input from the pointing device indicates a selection by the pointing device; and expanding the node corresponding to the selected node symbol to display sub-nodes of the node in the pane (col 7, ln 1-9).

As to claim 6, Ching teaches the input from the pointing device corresponds to a mouse button click (col 7, ln 2-5).

As to claim 7, Ching teaches determining when a pointer that is manipulated by a pointing device is guided over a node symbol and when an input from the pointing device indicates a selection by the pointing device; and collapsing the node corresponding to the selected node symbol such that sub-nodes of the selected node are not displayed in the pane (col 7, ln 2-5).

As to claim 8, Yedula teaches detecting that a pointer that is manipulated by a pointing device is guided over a portion of a displayed node in the hierarchical tree and that an input from the pointing device has been received such that the displayed node is selected; and displaying a

list of properties for the selected node of a displayed hierarchical tree in a separate pane of the graphical user interface in response to the selection (col 13, ln 27-31/ col 10, ln 55-64).

As to claims 9-12, they are apparatus claims of claims 1,5-6; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 5-6.

5. Claims **13-14, 16-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ching et al (US 6,407 761 B1) in view Vedula et al (US. 6,823,495 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brozowski et al (US. 6,559,871 B1).

As to claim 13, Ching teaches automatically generating code for the message structure (col 1, ln 55-59/ col 4, ln 66-67 to col 5, ln 1-5/ ln 23-29), the hierarchical structure of corresponding messages for the API calls (col 5, ln 7-10/ col 6, ln 22-25/ Fig. 8), the child note is selected from the group consisting of element nodes, field nodes, method nodes, and parameter nodes (col 6, ln 21-25/ Fig. 8), Vedula teaches the delimiter indicate a hierarchical (a user has selected record node RECORD1 in the source tree 6 as indicated by node selection indicia 18a in FIG. 3A, the source node properties page 34 may indicate the name, description, type, model, content, and other properties associated with the node Record1, col 10, ln 30-36).

Ching and Vedula do not teach displaying a representation for a root node in response to a request to display, receiving a request to add a child node to the root node, displaying a representation of the added child node to the root node. However, Brozonwski teaches displaying a representation for a root node in response to a request to display (executing on the request to load data; and loading the obtained data into the tree navigator graphical user interface,

displaying at least a portion of the obtained data in the tree view display, receiving a request to add a child node to the root node, displaying a representation of the added child node to the root node (a request to load the child objects of the object displayed in the branch is received at the tree navigator graphical user interface, col 15, ln 50-53).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Ching, Vedula to incorporate the features of displaying a representation for a root node in response to a request to display, receiving a request to add a child node to the root node, displaying a representation of the added child node to the root node because this allows user can continue to view data and navigate the tree view display while awaiting a response to the request to load data.

As to claim 14, Brozonwski teaches receiving a request to add a sub-node to the child node; and displaying a representation of the added sub-node such that the hierarchical relationship between the added sub-node and the child node is illustrated in a hierarchical tree (col 15, ln 50-53).

As to claim 16, it is an apparatus claim of claim 8; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 8 above.

As to claim 17, Ching teaches the child node that is added is selected from a pre-programmed API function (col 5, ln 7-10).

As to claim18, Ching teaches the child node that is added is selected from a pre-programmed interface method (col 5, ln 7-10).

As to claims 19, 20, they are apparatus claims of claim 13; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 13 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 15 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomson, William can be reached on (571) 272 3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

April 12, 2007

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER